J.M. Gray

Christ in the Sacrificial Offerings

BS1255
.8.G77

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
SEP 26 1960
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
BS1255
.8.G77

Christ in the Sacrificial Offerings

Bible Studies in Leviticus

JAMES M. GRAY, D. D.

BS1285
.S.G77

LIBRARY OF PRI
OCT 18 193
TEMPLE SEMINARY

Christ in the Sacrificial Offerings

Bible Studies in Leviticus

BY

JAMES M. GRAY, D. D.

Minister in the Reformed Episcopal Church; President of the Moody Bible Institute of Chicago; Consulting Editor of the *Scofield Reference Bible* and the *Tercentenary* (1911) *Edition of the King James Version;* Author of *Christian Workers' Commentary, Great Epochs of Sacred History, How to Master the English Bible, Primers of the Faith, Synthetic Bible Studies,* etc.

CHICAGO
THE BIBLE INSTITUTE COLPORTAGE ASSOCIATION
826 North La Salle Street

Copyright, 1924,
By
The Bible Institute Colportage Association
of Chicago

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Christ in the Sacrificial Offerings
Bible Studies in Leviticus

PREFATORY NOTE

IN THESE studies it is intended to follow the method and be guided mainly by the treatment of the subject in *The Book of Leviticus*, by Rev. S. H. Kellogg, D. D., LL. D., one time professor of theology in the Presbyterian Seminary, Allegheny, Pa., missionary to India, and author of *The Jews, or, Prediction and Fulfilment; The Light of Asia and the Light of the World; Handbook of Comparative Religion*, etc.

Of course, there are many other commentaries on the book of Leviticus as well as books ably treating of different portions of it. We mention a few in the event of readers desiring to go further into its study as it is hoped may be the case. Some of the following are out of print and some are English publications which may be a little difficult to obtain, but any of them may be occasionally picked up in a second-hand book store, and are well worth having in any pastor's library and for home reading:

The Typology of Scripture, by Patrick Fairbairn, 2 volumes; *Holy Types*, by Joseph A. Seiss; *The Study of the Types*, by Ada R. Habershon; *The Law of the Offerings*, by Andrew Jukes; *Studies in the Mosaic Institutions*, by W. G. Moorehead; *Studies in Leviticus*, by Herbert Brooke, and *Thoughts on Leviticus*, by B. W. Newton.

More than any of the above however, Kellogg is to be preferred for the thoroughness and saneness of his treatment of the difficult and mysterious themes, and the order and simplicity of his style. That his volume should be out of print, originally part of the *Expositor's Bible* (Armstrong), is a great disappointment, but the hope is entertained that it may yet be reprinted again. Meanwhile these studies, limited and inadequate as they are, may serve to keep the name of the book alive as well as stimulate a deeper interest in the portion of revelation with which it deals.

LESSON 1

Introductory

1. Origin and Authority

To some persons it is quite impossible to understand the book of Leviticus, and to not a few it seems to have no living relation to present day questions of Christian belief and practice; for which reasons it is difficult for them to believe in its divine authority and much less in its divine inspiration.

Nevertheless, the opening words of the book clearly affirm its authority by speaking of its Mosaic origin and the fact that it came to Moses as a revelation from God. "And the Lord called unto Moses, and spake unto him out of the tabernacle of the congregation, saying * * *." Furthermore, these same words or their equivalent occur some fifty-four times in the twenty-seven chapters of the book. Therefore, when they and their immediate context are eliminated from the book, scarcely anything is left.

It is to be noted further, that our

Lord Jesus Christ endorsed this affirmation in the book by endorsing the whole Pentateuch, of which the book is a part. See for examples, Matthew 5:18; Luke 24:44 and John 5:46, 47. In these passages, he speaks of "the law" and "the law of Moses" by which his contemporaries understood him to mean the Pentateuch, or the first five books of the Bible.

But not only did our Lord endorse the Pentateuch in general, but the book of Leviticus in particular. In Matthew 8:4 and John 7:22, as well as in other places, he quotes certain revealed laws which are found only in Leviticus.

Of course it is easy to say, as the destructive critics *do* say, that Jesus was only a man like his contemporaries, and knew no better than they; that Moses was not the author of the Pentateuch, and that it was not inspired. Or, if this be seriously objected to, they would say that while Jesus knew better, yet He accommodated Himself to the limitations of His hearers and did not think it necessary to correct their ignorance on that point.

The best answer we can make to the above, however, is to point to the New Testament, and especially the four Gospels, which reveal the person of Christ to us. The person there revealed was not a man like His contemporaries, but the God-man who knew whereof He spake, and whose word is accepted at least by the author of these studies, as absolute authority.

To refer once more to the opening words of the book, "And the Lord said," they very closely connect it historically with the preceding book,

2. Occasion and Content

Exodus, just as that book is connected with Genesis.

Quoting Brooke here, "This intimate relation between the opening books of the Bible serves not only to tell us that they are given in proper order for an intelligent grasp of their history and meaning, but suggests also that their spiritual use and purpose must be apprehended in the same order. They are the a b c of religious knowledge."

Genesis shows man's ruin by sin, and makes it plain that in every condition of trial he only comes out a failure—in Eden, before the flood, after the flood, and in the chosen family of Abraham, still man fails.

The chosen family of Abraham are found, in the last chapter of Genesis, in the land of Egypt, the emblem of a world that knows not God. Exodus takes up their story there and proceeds to reveal how God redeems and delivers them out of their hopeless bondage, separating them unto Himself, and appropriating them as His people. Its closing chapter signifies the accomplishment of the first stage of this redemption, and shows God dwelling among them and manifesting His presence in the tabernacle, or "the tent of meeting."

Now comes Leviticus, which is entirely occupied with the condition of those who are thus redeemed, delivered, brought nigh, and possessed by God.

The book may be sub-divided into several sections, but Brooke limits them to four.

The first section comprises the first seven chapters and is marked by the repetition of the words "sacrifice," "offering," and "oblation." In other words, we have in this section what some identify as "the law of the offerings."

The next section comprises chapters 8 to 10, and is occupied with the consecration of Aaron and his sons.

The third section covers chapters 11 to 16, and is distinguished by the words "clean" and "unclean" and their compounds—the keynote to which is, therefore, purity.

The fourth section covers chapters 17 to 25, with an appendix of two closing chapters. This is marked by the words "holy" and "sanctify," which, with their compounds, give the subject of holiness as the keynote to this portion of the book.

The appendix is a supplementary revelation on voluntary vows and dues, and also speaks of the blessing or cursing

which will fall upon the people, as they obey or disobey what Jehovah has thus revealed to them as His will.

3. Purpose of the Book

In general terms the purpose of Leviticus is to give directions to the people of Israel how to live as a holy nation in fellowship with God—the keynote of the whole being "HOLINESS TO JEHOVAH." But in particular, the book furnishes to the theocracy (for that is what Israel is meant to be—a government under the immediate sovereignty of God), a code of laws to secure their physical, moral and spiritual welfare. And yet, all this is merely a means to an end, the end being to make Israel a blessing to all the nations of the earth, mediating to them the redemption of God through Christ Jesus His Son.

To accomplish this blessing for the nations, certain things were necessary in the history of Israel.

(1) It was necessary to keep Israel separate from the heathen nations round about, and as a matter of fact, even the imperfect obedience to these laws which Israel has rendered, has made that nation unique among all the other nations to this day.

(2) It was necessary to reveal in and to Israel the real character of God, particularly His unapproachable holiness.

(3) This revelation of God's holiness was made in the first place by means of the system of sacrifices, the outstanding lesson of which was that "without shedding of blood is no remission." It was made also, by means of the precepts of the law and the severity of its penalties.

(4) But the sacrificial system and the law were not only to reveal God's holiness, but also His mercy, because in the shedding of blood there is found to be remission for all who will accept the offer.

(5) The sacrificial system and the law were adapted to reveal God in His holiness and mercy, and equally adapted to train Israel for her mission by suggesting to every thoughtful Israelite that there must be a secret of redeeming mercy *yet to be revealed.*

In other words, the sacrificial system and the law were so ordered as to be directly typical and prophetic of our Lord Jesus Christ and His great redemption. Cf. Luke 24:27; John 5:46; Hebrews 8:5; 9:23, 26.

4. Present Day Use

In the study of this book, it is important to keep in mind,

(1) That as a revelation of the character of God, it is of as much use to us as it was to Israel. The present writer can testify that he obtained his first true knowledge of God from the Old Testament rather than the New, and that Leviticus was a factor in it. In one sense, he knew Jehovah before he knew Jesus, and he well remembers the day and the place when it first dawned upon his deeper consciousness that the two were one.

(2) But this book reveals to us not only the character of God, but the fundamental condition of pure and undefiled religion, namely, that there is for sinful man no citizenship in the kingdom of God apart from a high priest and a propitiatory sacrifice.

(3) Inasmuch as the book is a body of civil law for the theocracy, it suggests principles for the guidance of all human legislators today,—their guidance as to the relation of civil government to religion, the rights of labor and capital, land holding and taxes, marriage and divorce, the social evil, and the punishment of murder and other crimes. Dr. Kellogg makes this very clear, and his commentary would be a valuable textbook in college classes on civil government.

(4) It reveals Christ in type as the sinner's Saviour, and the One who exalts him to future dignity as a redeemed man.

(5) It reveals things yet to come in the Messiah's kingdom as foreshadowed in the feasts of Pentecost, the Trumpets, the Day of Atonement, and the Jubilee and Sabbatic years. All of these will be realized for corporate Israel in the fullest sense in the millennial age, and

through Israel all the earth will thus be blessed.

This present series of studies does not contemplate anything beyond the sacrificial offerings, but if, in God's providence, we should go further, there would be "things new and old" to be brought out of the sacred text down to the very end.

Review Questions

1. What evidence of its divine authority does the book of Leviticus contain?
2. How does the New Testament confirm that evidence?
3. Show the distinctions among the first three books of the Pentateuch from the spiritual point of view.
4. Divide Leviticus into four parts.
5. For what two purposes was Leviticus revealed, so far as Israel is concerned?
6. What was the end in view?
7. What five things were necessary to accomplish this end?
8. How many of the New Testament references in this lesson have you examined and compared?
9. What are the five present day uses of this book?

LESSON II

The Burnt-Offering
Leviticus 1:1-17;6:8-13

1. How to Interpret the Offerings

WE SHOULD not attempt to interpret the Levitical offerings by our own fancy as to what they may symbolize or by our thought as to what the Israelites might have considered them to mean. Our guide must be the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments so far as they interpret them.

For example, Leviticus 21:6 tells us that the offerings are the "bread" of God, not material bread of course, as we may learn from Psalm 50:8-15, but representing what that Psalm speaks of, namely, thanksgiving, fidelity, confiding trust and praise. This is the bread, or food, that the obedient Israelite offered to Jehovah in the sacrificial offerings. He acknowledged, in other words, that these things were God's due from him, and that he, because of sin, had never rendered them unto God. Therefore, because he had not rendered them, his life was forfeited, and he was now by faith presenting unto God the innocent life of another as a substitute for his own guilty one.

Of course, it is inconceivable that the life of an animal could in itself be a sufficient and proper substitute for human guilt, hence the victim must have symbolized a greater substitute, and as we shall see from other scriptures, that substitute was our Lord Jesus Christ. He is the only bread that can satisfy God, and in Him alone is God well pleased (Isa. 42:1; Matt. 3:17).

In further proof that the offerings were substitutionary in character, compare Leviticus 17:10-14, which teaches that the life of the soul is in the blood, and that it is poured out upon the altar to make atonement. In the Revised Version the last clause of verse 11 reads: "For it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life,"—that is, the life that is yielded up makes atonement for the one who offers it. For the application to Christ in the premises, see Matthew 26:28; John 1:29; Ephesians 1:7; 1 Peter 1:18, 19; 1 John 1:7.

It is essential, therefore, to the right interpretation of the offerings, that each of them is seen as typifying our Saviour in some aspect of His work. What these aspects are, we shall learn later.

"And the LORD called unto Moses, and spake unto him out of the tabernacle

2. Nature and Characteristic of the Burnt-Offering

of the congregation, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, If any man of you bring an offering unto the LORD, ye shall bring your offering of the cattle, even of the herd and of the flock. If his offering be a burnt sacrifice of the herd, let him offer a male without blemish; he shall offer it of his own voluntary will at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the LORD "(Lev. 1:1-3).

(1) Note the place from which Jehovah now speaks, namely, the Tabernacle or the "tent of meeting" (R. V.). It is not Sinai, because there the law was given, and there Israel had entered into covenant with Him, which covenant Moses, their mediator, had sealed with the sprinkling of the blood on the book and the people (Exod. 24:7,8; Heb. 9:19-21). There they had taken Jehovah for their God and He had taken them for His people. Therefore, He had now appointed this tent of meeting where He might dwell among and manifest His will to them as His people.

Quoting B. W. Newton here:

"The redeemed people of God only know God in the Tabernacle and none except those who belong to that Tabernacle or what it represented on earth, can belong to God in heaven; that is, only those who have by faith sprinkled the blood of and have fed on the Passover lamb. Egypt is the type of the position of all others. How important to remember this today when so many efforts are being made to destroy the distinctions which redemption has constituted and to speak of man's *natural* condition as having in it the elements of a right relationship of God. Men wish to sweep from the earth the Tabernacle and its lessons and to sanctify Egypt in the name of God!" (*Thoughts on Leviticus*, page 28.)

(2) Note that the carnivora are excluded from this offering, doubtless because animals which live by the death of others could not typify Him who came to give life. And only domestic animals are permitted, doubtless, because of the submission and obedience they represented in comparison with other animals taken captive in the chase (Isa. 53:7; John 10:17, 18). Also, as Kellogg and others think, because domestic animals were endeared to their owners by the cost of labor and care.

(3) Note that the word translated "burnt offerings" means "that which ascends," and is thus designated because it was wholly lifted up upon the altar, or because it was wholly burned on the altar and thence ascended in sweet smelling fragrance before Jehovah. To Him it was altogether devoted, no part of it was reserved except the skin. In other words, not only does God receive it all because He is well pleased with it all, but also absolutely nothing is reserved for the one who offers it His all belongs to God

(4) Note that the victim was to be a male, the strongest and best of its kind, and also without blemish, for only such could be a true type of the holy victim, Jesus Christ (Mal. 1:6, 13; Heb. 9:14).

(5) Note that the Israelite himself and not the priest, offers or presents the victim, and he does it "that he may be accepted before the Lord" (R. V.). The teaching here is that each one of us must take the Lord Jesus Christ for himself, and present Him by faith unto Jehovah as his own offering for his own acceptance. It is not enough for us to praise Christ or to seek to imitate Christ in order to be saved or to please God, but we must offer Him to God by faith as the substitute for our forfeited life on account of sin.

(6) Note that "at the door of the tabernacle" the substitute must be offered. In other words, publicity is demanded (Rom. 10:9, 10). And then again, idolatry must be guarded against, as in the worship of false gods in the groves and on the hills after the manner of the heathen. The teaching for us is that there must be no self-will in our worship, but that the Christ whom we confess and present to God as our substitute, must be the One whom God has revealed to us in the Gospels as His only begotten Son.

"And he shall put his hand upon the

head of the burnt-offering; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him. And he shall kill

3. Killing the Victim

the bullock before the LORD: and the priests, Aaron's sons, shall bring the blood, and sprinkle the blood round about upon the altar that is by the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.

"And he shall flay the burnt-offering, and cut it into his pieces" (Lev. 1:4-6).

(1) Note that the offerer lays his hand on the head of the offering, signifying his identification with it and his transference to it of that which he himself deserved. Compare the instance of the scape-goat (Lev. 16:21), and also the substitution of the Levites in the place of the first-born of Israel (Num. 8:10,11).

(2) Note the phrase "to make atonement for him." The Hebrew word means "to cover," and is first used when Noah is commanded to cover the ark with pitch (Gen. 6:14). Indeed the Hebrew for "pitch" is derived from this verb, because pitch covers that over which it is spread, and not only conceals but protects it. By the atonement, the offerer's sins were covered, hidden from God's sight, and he himself was protected from their consequences (cf. Ps. 32:1; Isa. 61:10). Newton from whom the above is taken, also calls attention to the Hebrew of the word "accepted," where the thought is not merely of the offerings being received, but received as grateful and excellent in the sight of Jehovah (cf. Ps. 149:4; Isa. 42:1; 1 Pet. 2:7, R. V.)

(3) Note that the offerer himself kills the victim; in other words, every sinner must regard himself as having caused the Saviour's death.

"My sins were laid on Thee,
Thou stoodest in the sinner's stead,
Didst bear all ills for me."

And he kills the victim "before the LORD," as if to say, "Against thee, thee only have I sinned and done this evil in thy sight" (Ps. 51:4).

(4) Note that the priests and not the offerer "present and sprinkle the blood." As Kellogg says, we who have offered Christ as our substitute, must leave Him to present the offering before God (Heb. 2:17; 7:25.)

(5) Note however, that the flaying and cutting was done by the offerer and not the priest. Why? Kellogg passes over this lightly, but Newton thinks, and one's heart agrees with him, that the offerer needed to possess a minute appreciation of the excellency of his offering in itself. So do we need to learn Christ. See also the comment on Verse 8.

"And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar, and lay the wood in order upon the fire: and the priests, Aaron's sons, shall lay the

4. The Burning

parts, the head, and the fat, in order upon the wood that is on the fire which is upon the altar: but his inwards and his legs shall he wash in water: and the priest shall burn all on the altar, to be a burnt-sacrifice, an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD" (Lev. 1:7-9).

It is one of the great objects of Leviticus to teach us to discriminate, to teach us how rightly to divide the Word of truth (2 Tim. 2:15), and Newton points to the minute specifications of verses 7 and 8 as an illustration of it. The various parts are all carefully distinguished from each other before they are laid on the altar, bringing before us in the type the importance attached in Scripture to a knowledge of what Christ really was while living and acting on the earth, His intelligence, healthfulness and activity of thought and feeling.

Persons and things intended to be types of Christ were frequently washed also, as in this case, that they might be fitter representatives of His essential purity. An exception of note as we shall see, was the sin-offering (Lev. 4), whose inwards were not washed, prefiguring our Lord who knew no sin, being smitten *as if* sin for us (2 Cor. 5:21).

The Hebrew word for "burn" here means "to burn as incense." A different word is used in the case of the sin-offering burned "without the camp." There Christ is seen bearing the devouring wrath of God, but here as "a sweet savour unto the LORD." "A sweet

savour of rest" is the way some translate it, recalling the margin of Genesis 8:21, where in the case of Noah's offering, "the LORD smelled a savour of rest." "Noah" means rest (Gen. 5:29, margin), typifying the new creation into which Christ will finally bring His redeemed people. Compare also Hebrew 4:9 (R. V.) for the rest into which His people are brought even now.

We thus perceive the special meaning of this offering. To the believing Israelite it meant that complete consecration unto God is essential to right worship, inasmuch as the fire consumed the whole beyond the offerer's recall forever. To the more thoughtful worshiper, however, it must have occurred that it was not himself nor his gift that thus ascended in full consecration to God, but a substituted one whom God had in mind though at that time unrevealed.

Thus whether understood or not, the offering pointed to a Victim of the future in whose person and work it should receive its full explication. That one, we repeat, is our Lord Jesus Christ, who is here representing His believing people in perfect consecration and self-surrender to His God and Father. For the New Testament application of the offering, compare such passages as Luke 2:49; John 4:34; Matthew 26:39; Hebrew 10:5-10, and many others.

Therefore, as Kellogg says, we are to plead not only the atoning death of Christ but also the transcendent merit of His life. Only we must not argue that as in the case of His atoning death. He died that we might not die, so He surrendered Himself to God in life that we might be released from the same surrender. Indeed, the exact opposite is the truth as we learn from His own words in the prayer offered just before His death, "For their sakes, I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth" (John 17:19). He procured our salvation by His death and became our perfect example in His life (Eph. 5:2).

"And if his offering be of the flocks, namely, of the sheep, or of the goats, for a burnt-sacrifice; he shall bring it a male without blemish.

5. Variations in the Offerings

"And he shall kill it on the side of the altar northward before the LORD; and the priests, Aaron's sons, shall sprinkle his blood round about upon the altar.

"And he shall cut it into his pieces, with his head and his fat: and the priest shall lay them in order on the wood that is on the fire which is upon the altar:

"But he shall wash the inwards and the legs with water: and the priest shall bring it all, and burn it upon the altar: it is a burnt-sacrifice, an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD" (Lev. 1:10-13).

Note the variation here from a bullock (v. 3) to a sheep or goat, and for its reason or explanation compare 5:7 with 2 Corinthians 8:12. In these places we are taught that poverty was no plea for not bringing a burnt-offering. Thus we see mercy mingling with justice in this case, inasmuch as the lesser offering under the circumstances would be equally acceptable with the greater one. And so antitypically considered, there ought to be in Christian believers sufficient enlargement of faith to form a proper conception of Christ as our burnt-offering, but if this be wanting, even a partial apprehension of faith is not without value. Compare the faith of the apostle John with that of the Jewish ruler Nicodemus as an illustration of this.

"And if the burnt-sacrifice for his offering to the LORD be of fowls, then he shall bring his offering of turtledoves, or of young pigeons.

"And the priest shall bring it unto the altar, and wring off his head, and burn it on the altar; and the blood thereof shall be wrung out at the side of the altar:

"And he shall pluck away his crop with his feathers, and cast it beside the altar on the east part, by the place of the ashes:

"And he shall cleave it with the wings thereof, but shall not divide it asunder: and the priest shall burn it upon the altar, upon the wood that is upon the fire: it is a burnt-sacrifice, an

offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD" (Lev. 1:14-17).

(1) Provision for the poor is still further illustrated here, and the anti-typical application may be carried further also. For example, in the bullock we see Christ represented in His *service* for God and man, in the lamb we see Him in His unmurmuring *submission*, in the dove we see Him in His mourning *innocence*. Each of these qualities is equally true so far as Christ is represented by it, equally precious and equally acceptable, but no one of them brings out the complete character of our perfect offering which it requires all three to do.

(2) Here the offering was killed but not divided, doubtless because so small a creature did not require it in order to its entire consumption. But from the anti-typical point of view it illustrates the Christian who fails to see in Christ all that others see of His daily walk and thoughts and feelings. Discriminative apprehension is thus almost wholly wanting in this offering as it is in the faith of many Christians, but yet they are accepted in Christ for all that, just as the Israelite who brought a fowl to the altar was as fully accepted as he who brought a lamb or even a bullock.

(3) In this instance the offerer does not kill the victim, which is done by the priest, a circumstance which gives occasion to bring out another principle of the offerings not yet mentioned. For example, Christ has been spoken of as represented by the offering and represented by the priest, but as Jukes points out more clearly than some others, He is also represented by the *offerer*. Indeed so manifold are the relations in which Christ has stood *for* man and *to* man, that no one type or set of types can adequately represent the fulness of them.

"In the selfsame type the offerer sets forth Christ as the One who became man to meet God's requirements; the offering sets Him forth as the victim by which the atonement was ratified and the priest sets Him forth as the appointed mediator and intercessor. Therefore, when we have a type in which the offering is most prominent, the leading thought is of Christ the victim, while in one in which the offerer or the priest predominates, it will be respectively Christ as man or Christ as mediator" (*The Law of the Offerings*, pp. 36, 37).

In the present instance, the priest does nearly everything, setting before us in type the truth that to some believers Christ is chiefly known not in His blessed person, but chiefly in His office as the Mediator. But nevertheless, the offering is still acceptable as a sweet savour unto the Lord.

6. The Continual Burnt-Offering

"And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Command Aaron and his sons, saying, This is the law of the burnt-offering: It is the burnt-offering, because of the burning upon the altar all night unto the morning, and the fire of the altar shall be burning in it.

"And the priest shall put on his linen garment, and his linen breeches shall he put upon his flesh, and take up the ashes which the fire hath consumed with the burnt-offering on the altar, and he shall put them beside the altar.

"And he shall put off his garments, and put on other garments, and carry forth the ashes without the camp unto a clean place.

"And the fire upon the altar shall be burning in it; it shall not be put out; and the priest shall burn wood on it every morning, and lay the burnt-offering in order upon it; and he shall burn thereon the fat of the peace-offerings.

"The fire shall ever be burning upon the altar; it shall never go out" (Lev. 6:8-13).

(1) Note that this law is addressed not to the individual Israelite as such but to the priests, Aaron and his sons.

(2) Note that the design was that the fire of the burnt-offering should be continually ascending unto God. Compare Exodus 29:38-46 where provision is made for the offering of a lamb for the whole people every morning and evening, symbolizing the constant renewal of Israel's consecration unto the Lord.

(3) Note that the regulations in this case are intended to provide for the uninterrupted maintenance of this fire; i. e., the regular removal of the ashes

which otherwise would smother the fire, and secondly, the supply of fuel.

(4) Note that even the removal of the ashes is a priestly function as indicated in the garments which the priest must put on, and which also must be put off again when the ashes are removed from beside the altar to a place outside the camp; this for the reason that it was forbidden to wear the priestly garments except within the tent of meeting.

(5) Note that during the day when any Israelite brought an offering, the fire was thus ready to consume it and that the smoke thereof continually ascended unto the Lord.

As Kellogg says: "The significance of this can hardly be missed—signifying to Israel and also to us, that the consecration which the Lord desires from His people is not occasional but continuous." Each morning we should put away all that might dull the frame of our devotion, and each evening before we retire, we should by a solemn act of self-dedication, give ourselves anew unto the Lord.

Of course, we must not forget that here as in the other instances, we are pointed to Christ. He is our burnt-offering who continually offers Himself to God in our behalf. In a later lesson, we shall see that this is not true of the sin offering which our Lord presented once for all, but as our burnt-offering His full consecration to God for us never ceases and never shall cease.

Review Questions

1. By what guide should we interpret the Levitical offerings?
2. How does Leviticus 17:11 prove the substitutionary character of the offerings?
3. What is the significance of the "tent of meeting"?
4. Why must the Israelite present his own offering?
5. What is the two-fold significance of the laying on of hands?
6. What double meaning does the word atonement convey?
7. What did the burnt-offering mean to the believing Israelite?
8. How is mercy mingled with justice in this offering?
9. State how Christ is set forth by the offerer, the offering, and the priest.
10. What is the spiritual significance of the whole burnt-offering?
11. How many Scripture references are found in this lesson, and to how many have you carefully referred?

LESSON III

The Meal-Offering
Leviticus 2:1-16; 6:14-23

1. Interpretations

WE ADOPT in this case the revised rendering of "meal"—instead of "meat" offering. The word in the Hebrew means primarily, a present, and so it is sometimes translated (Gen. 32:13; Ps. 72:10; Isa. 39:1). The fundamental idea of the offering seems to be a gift brought by the worshiper to God in recognition of His authority and expressing a desire for His favor.

It is noticeable that while in the burnt-offering a *life* was given to God, here it was simply the products of the soil. There also we have the laying on of hands, transferring the obligation of death for sin, but here there is no shedding of blood. In other words, while the conception of a gift to God is of course dominant in the burnt-offering, yet there is not the *only* thing expressed, while here it is.

The above is Kellogg's way of looking at it, but Newton presents a somewhat different idea which has perhaps greater merit. In either case, we must remember, the anti-type is Christ. It is really He who is being presented to God in the meal-offering; but Newton thinks that while in the burnt-offering we see Christ in His devotion to God, in the meal-offering we see Him in His perfect character. Both His devotion and His character are set forth in each offering, but the one is *dominant* in the burnt-

offering and the other in the meal-offering. We regret that we have not space to enlarge upon Newton's distinction between perfectness of devotedness as he expresses it, and perfectness of character. The first may owe its origin to circumstances, but the latter is possible only where every inward feeling as well as outward action is in habitual conformity with God. Such was the perfectness of character of the Lord Jesus, and how it is expressed in the meal-offering will be touched upon as we proceed.

Jukes has still another interpretation of the meal-offering, going back to man's beginning in Eden where God gave to him the fruit of the ground as his portion, and reserved life for Himself. It was not till after the flood that man was permitted to eat flesh, and even then the life, the blood, was prohibited to him (Gen. 1:29; 9:4). Life as an emblem therefore, represented what the creature owes to God, while the fruit of the earth as an emblem, represents what the creature owes to his fellow-creature, what man owes to man. Thus in the burnt-offering, the surrender of life to God represents the fulfilment of man's duty to God, yielding to Him the portion that satisfies His claim. And in the meal-offering, the gift of the fruit of the earth represents the fulfilment of man's duty to his neighbor. In the latter offering man is surrendering himself to God of course, but doing so that he may give man his portion. The first of the two fulfills the first table of the law, and the second fulfills the second table. Of course, in both cases, the offering is but one, viz., Jesus Christ, in one case fulfilling for fallen man his duty to God and in the other his duty to man. Oh, what a wonderful Saviour!

Finally, before we leave the interpretation of the meal-offering, let it be noted that while its object is not to direct attention to the infliction of death on the great Substitute but to the character of Him who met death, yet as Newton is careful to point out, death is nevertheless implied. Whenever any offering typifying Christ either in His character or in His work was burned on the altar for a sweet savour, as in this case, there is necessarily a reference to the cross, and therefore to His death. Moreover, the meal-offering may virtually be considered only as an *appendage* to the burnt-offering which expressed death (Num. 15:3, 4). The words "burnt-offering and his meal-offering" are of continual occurrence, thus showing that they go together, and as there was a perpetual burnt-offering so also as we shall see, was there a perpetual meal-offering.

"And when any will offer a meal-offering unto the LORD, his offering shall be of fine flour; and he shall pour oil upon it, and put frankincense thereon" (Lev. 2:1).

2. Nature of the Offering

Three things are mentioned here, fine flour, oil, frankincense. The first is one of the strongest types of meek subduedness that it is possible for nature to supply. There is absolutely no unevenness in fine flour. All of Christ's actions were subordinate to the will of His Father, in other words, and all were according to the Holy Spirit; everything He said or did was said or done in the power of the Spirit. This was typically recognized by the offerer (though unknown to him as a matter of experience) when he poured oil, the emblem of the Spirit, on the fine flour.

And the frankincense also was typical. This gum of snowy whiteness was the emblem of purity, a purity which, when searched into by the fire, went up in grateful fragrance. (Cf. here also Ps. 141:2; Luke 1:10; Rev. 5:8).

"And he shall bring it to Aaron's sons the priests: and he shall take thereout his handful of the flour thereof, and of the oil thereof, with all the frankincense thereof; and the priest shall burn the memorial of it upon the altar, to be an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD:

3. Its Presentation

"And the remnant of the meal-offering shall be Aaron's and his sons: it is a thing most holy of the offerings of the LORD made by fire" (Lev. 2:2, 3).

Note first, that as in the burnt-offering, the offerer must bring the offering himself, it is his own voluntary act.

Secondly, he (or the priest?) takes out only a handful of the flour to be burned, but the handful represents the consecration of the whole (Rom. 11:16). Thirdly, the priest burns "the memorial of it on the altar." Thus the heavenly High Priest must always act on our behalf with God. Fourthly, "the remnant shall be Aaron's and his sons." The priest thus obtains the larger portion because as God's servant, he needs it for his support in the work of God's house. It is the way God took to supply him with his daily bread. He could not work for it as others did. But just here a very assuring and beautiful spiritual truth is brought to light, viz., that while the meal-offering by its perfectness satisfies God, it also provides something to comfort, feed and strengthen man. That is to say, unless the excellency of Christ's character had been presented and accepted for us, we would have been without hope, but when we know that it has been thus presented and accepted, we feed on it and give God thanks.

This is the way Jukes expresses it: Christ as performing man's duty to God in the burnt-offering, was wholly the food of God, wholly consumed by Him. But Christ as performing man's duty to man in the meal-offering, becomes also man's food. The offering in other words is offered *for us* to God, but also given *to us* as the priests of God, for all Christian believers are priests. The Gospels are full of this aspect of Christ's work for us, since they so constantly show us that while His meat was to do the will of Him that sent Him, yet in the doing of that will He was ever the devoted servant of all around Him (Acts 10:38).

4. The Baked Variety

"And if thou bring an oblation of a meal-offering baken in the oven, it shall be unleavened cakes of fine flour mingled with oil, or unleavened wafers anointed with oil.

"And if thy oblation be a meal-offering baken in a pan, it shall be of fine flour unleavened, mingled with oil. Thou shalt part it in pieces, and pour oil thereon: it is a meal-offering.

"And if thy oblation be a meal-offering baken in the frying pan, it shall be made of fine flour with oil.

"And thou shalt bring the meal-offering that is made of these things unto the LORD: and when it is presented unto the priest, he shall bring it unto the altar.

"And the priest shall take from the meal-offering a memorial thereof, and shall burn it upon the altar: it is an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD.

"And that which is left of the meal-offering shall be Aaron's and his sons': it is a thing most holy of the offerings of the LORD made by fire" (Lev. 2:4-10).

In certain cases the meal-offering might be baked in the oven, in a pan (a flat plate), or a frying pan. This signifies, as did the less costly varieties of the burnt-offering, that the poverty of the people was considered. The law accommodated itself, so to speak, to the different material resources of the worshipers.

But as Newton shows, there is such a thing as poverty of faith, a more limited apprehension of the character of Christ on the part of some believers than others. This is symbolized in the making of the flour into cakes and in the different methods employed.

To illustrate, there were certain *principles* in the character of Christ which made that character what it was in its own excellency; and then there were certain circumstances in His life, His sufferings for example, in which that essential excellency was developed and made manifest to men. The first class of the meal-offering, i. e., the fine flour in its uncooked state, directs our attention to His essential excellency, the other varieties to the circumstances of its development. "We may see Jesus as our 'bread,' or even as God's bread, without entering into the thoughts suggested by the emblem of the fine flour and the frankincense. The perfect absence of all unevenness, and the precious savour of the offering, these are not our first views of Jesus, they are the most perfect apprehensions, and so are they generally the last" (Jukes).

The action of the fire in the cases of the oven and the frying-pan, especially the latter, presents to the eye a vivid

picture of palpable suffering, teaching us apparently that where faith is weakest or dullest and the scope of apprehension most narrowed, then the thought of the suffering displayed becomes the most prominent or exclusive one (Newton).

5. Leaven, Honey and Salt

"No meal-offering, which ye shall bring unto the LORD, shall be made with leaven: for ye shall burn no leaven, nor any honey, in any offering of the LORD made by fire.

"As for the oblation of the first-fruits, ye shall offer them unto the LORD: but they shall not be burnt on the altar for a sweet savour.

"And every oblation of thy meal-offering shalt thou season with salt; neither shalt thou suffer the salt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking from thy meal-offering: with all thine offerings thou shalt offer salt" (Lev. 2:11-13).

The symbolism here is familiar. Leaven is a principle of decay, and without a single exception in Scripture it symbolizes spiritual corruption (1 Cor. 5:7). Honey also tends to promote fermentation and decay in that with which it is mixed. Hence from all our works which we present to God, wickedness in every form must be eliminated. This includes our religious work for, as Kellogg remarks, it is sadly possible to call Christ "Lord," and in His name do many wonderful works, which are not really done unto Him. (Read here 1 Cor. 10:31). How much therefore we need Christ as our meal-offering!

Speaking further of the honey, Paul reminds us how the corruptible, honey-like sweetness of nature insidiously infuses itself into the highest development of Christian graces, when he says to the Philippians, "I pray that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all judgment (i. e. discrimination), that ye may approve things that are excellent" (1:9, 10). Private predilections, in other words, must not determine our preferences. This is honey if the preference is the result of a natural amiability of character that shrinks from giving pain. The affection of Christ for His mother, for example, was perfect. He was not without affection, but he never exercised it apart from God, and like every other element of His character, it was fit to be presented on the altar. It had no "honey" in it.

"Salt" here is set over in contrast with honey. If the latter gives to character an earthly sweetness, the former gives to it a heavenly savour (Col. 4:6). Salt is the preservation against corruption, the emblem of perpetuity.

We are told that in India and other eastern countries the usual word for perfidy and breach of faith is, literally, "unfaithfulness for salt"; and a man will say, "Can you distrust me? Have I not eaten of your salt?" (Kellogg). So in the meal-offering, as in all offerings made by fire, the thought was that Jehovah and the Israelite, as it were, partake of salt together, in token of the eternal permanence of the holy covenant of salvation into which the offerer has entered with God.

6. The First-Fruits

"And if thou offer a meal-offering of thy first-fruits unto the LORD, thou shalt offer for the meal-offering of thy first-fruits green ears of corn dried by the fire, even corn beaten out of full ears.

"And thou shalt put oil upon it, and lay frankincense thereon: it is a meal-offering.

"And the priest shall burn the memorial of it, part of the beaten corn thereof, and part of the oil thereof, with all the frankincense thereof: it is an offering made by fire unto the LORD" (Lev. 2:14-16).

Parched grain as an article of food was more or less used by all, as it is still used in the East, by even the poorest of the people. They might be too poor to own so much as an oven or a frying-pan, but they could obtain parched grain.

The green, fresh, tender ear was to be dried (parched or roasted) by fire, a Hebrew word expressing great intensity of suffering when applied to a living person, (see for example Jer. 29:22). "Full ears" meant fruit of the earliest and finest quality. A clear type in every particular of the excellency of Christ, as well as

the intensity of His sufferings on behalf of His people.

Verse 12, which seems to be parenthetic in its location, really belongs to this part of the chapter, and raises two questions. First, What is the significance of "first-fruits"? And, why should it not be burnt on the altar for a sweet savour? The answers to these questions will have to be postponed until we reach a later chapter dealing particularly with first-fruits.

7. The Continual Meal-Offering

For the Scripture text in this case, the reader is referred to Leviticus 6:14-23. It teaches us that as in the law of the burnt-offering there was not only the offerings of the individual Israelites, but also the daily or perpetual burnt-offerings of the priests, so it was also in the case of the meal-offering. Even the amount was prescribed, "the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour, half of it in the morning, and half thereof in the evening" (v. 19). This apparently was the amount regarded as a day's portion of food.

The daily burnt-offering presented by Aaron and his successors typified our heavenly High Priest offering His person in daily consecration unto God in our behalf. And so in the daily meal-offering we see Him offering unto God in perfect consecration day by day, perpetually, all His works for our acceptance.

To the Christian believer often oppressed with the imperfection of his own consecration of his daily works, often oppressed because his heavenly Father is not glorified by him as He should be glorified, how exceedingly comforting is this view of Christ! That which even at our very best we do so imperfectly and interruptedly, He does for us perfectly and with never failing constancy. Thus He perfectly glorifies the Father and through the boundless merit of His consecration, He constantly procures for us daily grace unto life eternal (Kellogg).

Review Questions

1. What is the fundamental idea of the meal-offering?
2. Can you state the three different interpretations of it given by Kellogg, Newton and Jukes?
3. Which do you regard as the most satisfactory?
4. What is meant by "poverty of faith" and how is it symbolized in the varieties of this offering?
5. How would you apply to Christian character the absence of honey from this offering?
6. What does the presence of the salt signify?
7. What does the daily meal-offering typify as to Christ's work for us?

LESSON IV

The Peace-Offering, Leviticus 3:1-17; 7:11-34

THE main object of this offering, distinguishing it from the two preceding, is that of a sacrifice ending in a sacrificial meal. This meal expresses the idea of peace and fellowship with God secured by the blood atonement.

1. Nature of the Offering

"And if his oblation be a sacrifice of peace-offering, if he offer it of the herd; whether it be a male or female, he shall offer it without blemish before the LORD.

"And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the offering and kill it at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation: and Aaron's sons the priests shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar round about.

"And he shall offer of the sacrifice of the peace-offering an offering made by fire unto the LORD; the fat that covereth the inwards, and all the fat that is upon the inwards,

"And the two kidneys, and the fat

that is on them, which is by the flanks, and the caul above the liver, with the kidneys, it shall he take away" (Lev. 3:1-4).

The first differentiating feature is that a female victim as well as a male was permitted, carrying out the idea of the various grades in the offerings, as previously illustrated. Another reason why a female was permitted here was because unlike the burnt-offering, the whole of the victim was not burned on the altar in consecration to God. Quoting Kellogg: "The idea of representation and expiation had a place in the peace-offering as in all bloody offerings, but here it was subordinate to the chief intent of the offering, which was to represent the victim as food given by God to Israel in the sacrificial meal. Thus we have a hint that the dominant thought in the peace-offering is not so much that of Christ as the holy Victim, our representative, but that of Christ, the Lamb of God, as the food of the soul through partaking of which we have fellowship with God."

In this offering that which was burned on the altar was only "the fat that covereth the inwards," "the two kidneys," and "the caul" (vv. 3, 4), the best and the richest parts. Quoting Newton: "No types could be chosen more strongly expressive of *inward* being. They are often mentioned in Scripture under the general expression 'reins and heart,' and as portraying Christ, our Substitute, they show Him as the one inwardly as well as outwardly perfect."

Where the victim was of the flock rather than the herd, to "the fat thereof" was added "the whole rump" or rather "the fat tail entire" (v. 9, R. V.). The reference is to a special eastern breed of sheep, whose tail grows to an immense size and consists almost entirely of a rich substance between fat and marrow. For the spiritual application of the fat parts of the victim, compare Psalm 36:8; Isaiah 25:6; Romans 11:7.

The third chapter concludes with a prohibition against the eating of either fat or blood. The reason for the prohibition of the blood was pointed out in the law of the burnt-offering. And the reason for the prohibition of the fat is similar, namely, its appropriation for God upon the altar. Thus the Israelite as often as he partook of his daily food was reminded of two things: (1) that the only ground of his acceptance before God was that of atonement by the blood, and (2) that God's claim on the man redeemed by the blood was a claim for the consecration of his best.

Kellogg reminds us that nothing is of more importance in the present day than to keep in mind the principles underlying these regulations. Many professed preachers of the gospel now refuse to recognize the place which propitiatory blood holds in that gospel. And on the other hand, many easy-going Christians seem satisfied to give the lean to God and keep the fat, the best fruit of their life and activity for themselves (Heb. 10:26-31).

Referring again to the law, it appears that this prohibition of the eating of fat referred only to the fat of such beasts as were used for sacrifice. With these, however, the law was absolute, whether the animal was presented for sacrifice or only slain for food. It held good with regard to these animals even when, because of the manner of their death, they could not be used for sacrifice. In such cases, though the fat might be used for other purposes, still it must not be used for food (Kellogg).

"And this is the law of the sacrifice of peace-offerings, which he shall offer unto the LORD.

2. Kinds of Offerings

"If he offer it for a thanksgiving, then he shall offer with the sacrifice of thanksgiving unleavened cakes mingled with oil, and unleavened wafers anointed with oil, and cakes mingled with oil, of fine flour, fried.

"Besides the cakes, he shall offer for his offering leavened bread with the sacrifice of thanksgiving of his peace-offerings.

"And of it he shall offer one out of the whole oblation for an heave-offering unto the LORD, and it shall be the priest's that sprinkleth the blood of the peace-offerings.

"And the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace-offerings for thanksgiving shall be eaten the same day that it is offered; he shall not leave any of it until the morning.

"But if the sacrifice of his offering be a vow, or a voluntary offering, it shall be eaten the same day that he offereth his sacrifice: and on the morrow also the remainder of it shall be eaten:

"But the remainder of the flesh of the sacrifice on the third day shall be burnt with fire.

"And if any of the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace-offerings be eaten at all on the third day, it shall not be accepted, neither shall it be imputed unto him that offereth it: it shall be an abomination, and the soul that eateth of it shall bear his iniquity" (Lev. 7:11-18).

Here we perceive (1) that peace-offerings might be of three kinds, a "sacrifice of thanksgiving," a "vow" or a "free-will offering." The first was offered in gratitude for mercies received (Ps. 116:16, 17); the second also for mercies received, but where the offering had been promised in advance upon that condition; the third was merely a spontaneous expression of the offerer's love to God and his desire to live in fellowship with Him.

(2) With the peace-offering a meal-offering of three kinds of unleavened cakes was to be offered (cf. Num. 15:2-4). Besides these "leavened bread" also was permitted (v. 13), but this was not to be placed upon the altar as for God, but to be eaten before God by the offerer, his family and friends. Of each of these cakes, leavened and unleavened, one was to be presented as a "heave-offering to the Lord, and it shall be the priests." "Heave-offering" is so called from its being heaved or lifted up on high, "in token that it was thereby directed to the God of heaven and devoutly proffered to His acceptance" (Bush).

(3) If the peace-offering were a sacrifice of thanksgiving, the flesh of the offering must be eaten the same day. If it were a vow or a free-will offering a part might remain until the second day, but the remainder if any, must be burnt with fire on the third day.

Doubtless the reason for this was that there might be no possible beginning of decay, a thought which reminds us that it was written of the Antitype, "Thou wilt not suffer thy Holy One to see corruption" (Ps. 16:10). Furthermore, the extreme limit of time allowed reminds us also that it was precisely on the third day that Christ arose from the dead in the incorruptible life of the resurrection so that He might forever continue to be the Living Bread of His people (Kellogg).

This is a good place to pause and enlarge upon the main object of the peace-offering as distinguishing it from the burnt and the meal-offerings. In the burnt-offering the burning ended the ceremonial, but in the peace-offering, after the burning of the part which belonged to God, there followed the culminating act in the eating of the sacrifice by the offerer and his household.

At Home With God

The chapter before us gives no directions as to how this sacrificial eating should be done, but these are found in Deuteronomy 12:6, 7; 17, 18. The eating was to take place not at the offerer's home but before the Lord at the tent of meeting. This was to show that the feast was not given by the worshiper to God, but given by God to the worshiper and partaken of in His house. In the first instance indeed, the offerer had brought and given the victim to God in expiation of his sin. But God, after receiving the offering, indicates what use is to be made of it. A part is burnt on the altar, God's portion; a part is given to the priests as their appointed sustenance from God's table whom they served, and a part is to feast the worshiper himself.

"Profoundly suggestive and instructive is the contrast between the heathen custom in this offering and the Levitical ordinance," says Kellogg. For the custom was widely spread among heathen peoples to observe a sacrificial feast where a victim was first offered to a deity and then its flesh eaten by the offerer

and his friends. But in the case of the heathen feasts it was men who feasted the god, while here it is God who feasts man. The idea of the natural man has always been, "I will be religious and make God my friend by doing something for Him or giving something to Him." But God teaches us the reverse. We become truly religious by first of all taking what He has provided for us. In the peace-offering in other words, where antitypically we have presented the Lamb of God as our peace, and the Priest has sprinkled for us the precious blood, not only is our sin pardoned, but in token of friendship thus restored, God invites the penitent believer to sit down at His table in joyful fellowship with Himself. The prodigal has returned and the Father is giving him the best He has.

Nor is this all. What is "the best He has" which the Father thus gives the prodigal? It is the same Victim whose blood was shed and sprinkled in atonement for his sin! The sacrifice of the altar and the food of the table are one and the same. He who offered Himself for our sins on Calvary is now given to the believer as his spiritual sustenance. Does the imagery seem strange and unnatural? "So," says Dr. Kellogg, "did it seem to the Jews in Christ's day, who wonderingly inquired: 'How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' (John 6:52)."

How the light begins now to flash back from the gospel to the Levitical law, and from this again back to the gospel!

3. The One Condition

"And the flesh that toucheth any unclean thing shall not be eaten; it shall be burnt with fire: and as for the flesh, all that be clean shall eat thereof.

"But the soul that eateth of the flesh of the sacrifice of peace-offerings, that pertain unto the LORD, having his uncleanness upon him, even that soul shall be cut off from his people.

"Moreover the soul that shall touch any unclean thing, as the uncleanness of man, or any unclean beast, or any abominable unclean thing, and eat of the flesh of the sacrifice of peace-offerings, which pertain unto the LORD, even that soul shall be cut off from his people" (Lev. 7:19-21).

This teaches us that there was one condition without which the Israelite could not have communion with God in the peace-offering. He must be clean, that is to say, there must be in him nothing which should interrupt fellowship with God. So also must the peace-offering itself be clean. There must be nothing in the type to make it an unfit symbol of the Antitype. Thus by the spirit of these commands are we likewise warned not to presume upon God's grace in providing a Lamb for us by living carelessly. To use and enjoy Christ as our peace-offering, we must keep ourselves "unspotted from the world" (James 1:27) and hate "even the garment spotted by the flesh" (Jude 23). Compare also 1 Peter 1:15, 16.

Nothing can be more important for the right comfort of our hearts than to meditate well on the relation of God to us as expressed in this offering. Being therefore justified by faith, let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ (Rom. 5:1, R. V.). In other words, being at peace with God, let us enjoy the peace which He has thus provided, let us feed on the peace sacrifice. The offerer seated at the table spread by the grace of God, is a type of the condition of every believer in Christ, however feeble he may be in apprehending the blessings that are his. Whenever the great day of eternity breaks, he will be recognized as one who is in fellowship with God at the table of peace sacrifice. The sin of our nature, that which of all things is most depressing and terrifying to an awakened heart, is met forever by this grace. Our sorrow thus is turned into joy and the cry of helpless despair exchanged for the voice of thanksgiving. The Lord hath done great things for us; whereof we are glad (Ps. 126:3). He hath given us the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness (Isa. 61:3) (Kellogg).

Review Questions

1. What is the main object of the peace-offering?

2. What is its dominant thought?
3. What is the significance of the "fat" being burned on the altar?
4. Of what two things was the Israelite reminded as he partook of his daily food?
5. How many kinds of peace-offerings might there be?
6. Define the "heave-offering."
7. Describe the contrast between the heathen custom in this offering and the Levitical ordinance.
8. What was the absolute condition for communion with God in the peace-offering?
9. What great truth in the Epistle to the Romans does this offering illuminate?

LESSON V

The Sin-Offering

Leviticus 4:1-35; 5:1-13

OBSERVE that the law of the sin-offering is introduced differently from any of the preceding offerings. In their cases the phraseology is thus: "If any man of you bring an offering unto the LORD" (1:2); "When any one will offer a meal-offering" (2:1); "If his oblation be a sacrifice of peace-offering" (3:1). But in this case, "If a soul shall sin . . . then let him bring . . . for a sin-offering" (4:2, 3).

In the first three the language implies, so Kellogg and others think, that the Israelites were familiar with the offering before its incorporation into the Levitical system, while the sin-offering is introduced as a new thing.

1. The Reason for the Sin-Offering

This agrees with facts. Each of the other offerings had been known and used by other nations, as well as by the patriarchs before Moses' time, but nothing had been heard of a sin-offering. The significance of this is that now in Israel the spiritual training of mankind "entered on a new stadium." The race is now to have developed within it a sense of sin and guilt it had never before experienced. The sin and guilt were there, but they had been inadequately known and felt. In this offering therefore, the idea of expiation by blood shedding is almost the only thought represented. Moreover in the order prescribed for the different sacrifices, the sin-offering was always the first in cases where the others also were offered. In the others, Israel was taught that fellowship with God depends upon atonement for sin, but here that is the dominant thought.

As Jukes expresses it, the sweet-savor offerings (burnt, meal, peace) were for acceptance, this for expiation. In those the faithful Israelite was seen satisfying Jehovah, here his offering is altogether charged with his sin. In the sin-offering as in the burnt-offering, Christ is the offerer as representing the Israelite, but here He does so as the one under the imputation of sin. Here He is taking up His people's sins as His own, and saying, "My sins, O God, are not hid from thee" (Ps. 69:5); "Innumerable evils have compassed me about; mine iniquities have taken hold upon me" (Ps. 40:12). Here He is "being made a curse for us" (Gal. 3:13). Oh, wondrous mystery of grace!

It might be well at this point to add a further thought from Jukes, as to the reason why the sin-offering was unknown before this time. He obtains his idea from the word "commandments" (**v** 2).

As Paul says in Romans 7:9, "I was alive without the law once, but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died." Israel had no law till Sinai. Burnt-offerings and meal-offerings

were offered by the patriarchs, but the law convicted men of sin and made necessary the sin-offering. Or to put it better, "the law entered that sin might abound" (Rom. 5:20). That is to say, the law was not given either to make or to prove men holy, but rather to prove us to ourselves to be what God has known us to be ever since the fall, i. e., sinners in His sight.

2. Graded Responsibility

"And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

"Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, If a soul shall sin through ignorance against any of the commandments of the LORD concerning things which ought not to be done, and shall do against any of them:

"If the priest that is anointed do sin according to the sin of the people; then let him bring for his sin, which he hath sinned, a young bullock without blemish unto the LORD for a sin-offering.

"And he shall bring the bullock unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the LORD; and shall lay his hand upon the bullock's head, and kill the bullock before the LORD" (Lev. 4:1-4).

(1) Note that the sins for which this sacrifice was appointed were those of *ignorance*, showing the absolute equity of God. He is just, but He takes notice of any palliating circumstance. (Cf. Matt. 26:41; Luke 12:48; Heb. 5:2).

But the necessity of this offering shows that palliation of sin does not nullify it. It *must* be atoned for. This bears on the responsibility of the heathen, whose ignorance where it is not wilful and avoidable diminishes their guilt, but does not cancel it.

But some one may say, the Israelite was obliged to bring his sin-offering only when he came to a knowledge of his sin! Yes, but that does not mean that his sin was passed over, as we shall see when we come to the law of the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16). Once every year a sin-offering was presented by the high priest for all the sins of Israel not atoned for in the sin-offerings of every day (cf. 1 Cor. 4:4, R. V.).

There is a prevailing feeling in human hearts that sins of ignorance are not sins. To act conscientiously, they think, is the same as to act blamelessly. It is for this reason that some do not desire to know more than they do. Light is disquieting and convicting.

But the heinousness of sins of ignorance is in the condition of heart which is capable of committing sin without knowing that it is sin. No one can ever doubt this after seriously pondering the significance of the sin-offering.

(2) Note the graded responsibility of sin in the application of the law to the *priest* who must bring "a young bullock" for his offering (4:3). This was the most valuable of all the varieties or grades of the offering, being the same indeed as must be offered "if the whole congregation of Israel sin" (4:13, 14). A ruler might bring a he-goat (4:23), and "one of the common people" might bring a female goat (4:28), or if unable to do that, "two turtle doves or two young pigeons" (5:7) or other substitutes (5:11).

As Kellogg says, "No one can well miss the meaning of this. The guilt of sin is proportioned to the rank and station of the offender (cf. James 3:1; and also Rev. 2 and 3 where 'the angel of the church' in every case is held responsible for the spiritual state of those committed to his charge)." The greater our privileges, the nearer we are brought to God; the more intimately we are connected with Him in service, the more terrible must be the consequences of transgression.—B. W. Newton.

(3) Note that according to this God holds nations, communities and all associations of men under obligation in their corporate capacity to keep His laws, and will not count them guiltless if they violate them even through ignorance. There is a universal tendency in Christendom to repudiate such responsibility, and what it shall mean one of these days is revealed in Scripture with startling clearness in the warning concerning the

Antichrist (2 Thess. 2:3-8; 1 John 2:18; Rev. 13:7).

(4) Note that the law concerning the common people is expanded more fully than any other part of it, reminding us that none is so lowly in station as to have his sins overlooked. There is no respect of persons with God.

3. The Ritual

"And the priest that is anointed shall take of the bullock's blood, and bring it to the tabernacle of the congregation:

"And the priest shall dip his finger in the blood, and sprinkle of the blood seven times before the LORD, before the vail of the sanctuary.

"And the priest shall put some of the blood upon the horns of the altar of sweet incense before the LORD, which is in the tabernacle of the congregation; and shall pour all the blood of the bullock at the bottom of the altar of the burnt-offering, which is at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation"(Lev. 4:5-7).

Here we have the ritual of the sin-offering. It differs in some respects from that of the other offerings, but the variations have all one intent. They fasten the mind of the offerer on the thought of expiating sin through the substitution of an innocent life for the guilty.

(1) In the other offerings where the idea of expiation had a secondary place, the blood of the victim, by whomsoever brought, might be applied to the sides of the altar only, i. e., the altar in the outer court commonly spoken of as the altar of burnt-offering. But here in the case of the priest, it must be sprinkled seven times before the Lord before the vail of the sanctuary, also upon the horns of the altar of incense before the Lord in the Tabernacle and "all the blood of the bullock shall he pour out at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offering." This must be done as well where the offering was for "the whole congregation," i. e., the nation (4:13-18).

When a ruler sinned it would be sufficient to sprinkle the blood on the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, and pour out the blood at the bottom of the altar (4:25). The same in the case of one of the common people (4:30), except when the latter was too poor to bring more than two doves or two pigeons, in which circumstance the blood was to be sprinkled only upon the side of the altar and the rest "wrung out at the bottom" (5:7-9).

(2) In these distinctions we see the blood brought ever nearer and nearer into the presence of God. The horns of the altar were more sacred than the sides; the altar before the vail was more sacred than that in the outer court; while the Most Holy Place was within the vail where the ark stood covered with the mercy seat. Here the blood was sprinkled once a year on the great Day of Atonement (Lev. 16).

Why these distinctions? A ruler or one of the common people had access only to the outer court, hence there the blood must be exhibited for the sin which defiled it. The priest ministered in the holy place, and for the same reason the blood must be exhibited there when he sinned. And the same principle held when the sin atoned for was that of the whole nation, for the priest represented the nation, and Israel in its corporate unity was a "kingdom of priests."

The last remark applies to Christian believers who are a "royal priesthood" (1 Pet. 2:9). Hence how much more evil a thing it is for Christians to sin in comparison with other people!

(3) The blood must be presented not before the offerer, not before the priest, but before the Lord (cf. Ps. 51:4).

Some are teaching today that the need of the atonement is found only in man and not at all in God. God could have pardoned sin without it, they say. Why then, was it called for? Their answer would be that man's heart was hard and rebellious and distrusted the divine love. Therefore, some stupendous exhibition of that love was necessary to disarm man's enmity and win him back.

If that were all that was intended by the atonement, why then this constant insistence as to where the blood should be presented? This does not minimize the love of God when we remember that

He appointed the sacrifice and that He Himself in the person of His Son accomplished it.

But if the shedding of blood were so essential in the putting away of sin, why, it may be asked, was there one case in which an exception might be made (5:11)?

The exception here was that of an extremely poor Israelite, and had it not been made there would have remained that class of persons in Israel whom God had excluded from the provision of the sin-offering, and yet He had made that offering the inseparable condition of forgiveness. As Kellogg puts it, here was a case very evidently in which something must be sacrificed in the symbolism since both of these truths could not be set forth with equal perfectness.

And yet even in this case, the prescriptions were such as to prevent any confounding of the sin-offering with the meal-offering which typified consecrated and accepted service. For example, the oil and the frankincense were both to be left out. Also, while the meal-offering had no limit as to the quantity to be used here, the amount is particularly prescribed "the tenth part of an ephah," representing the sustenance of one full day. Thus the support of life for one day was given up as forfeited by sin.

Here again we quote Jukes on the import of hese varied symbols, who remarks that in the sin-offering as in the burnt-offering they show us the different characters under which the offering of Christ may be apprehended by men. One saint has one view and another another. In the preceding offerings there was found an indistinctness in what was called the lower views of the offering—a mixing up of one aspect with another. And so it is here, until the thought of the sin-offering is seen to be very little different from that of the meal-offering. But though of "flour" it is still designated a "sin-offering."

How exactly this peculiarity in the type describes the way in which some apprehend our blessed Lord! Some see the pain and sorrow He had in service, the grinding and scorching of the meal-offering and they think this was His sin-bearing, being unable to distinguish between the trials of service and the curse of sin itself.

Jukes carries the thought forward to the matter of the blood-sprinkling on the different altars, which is unintelligible to those who have never considered the typical import of the relative parts of the Tabernacle. An atonement has been made for sin, this much people see, and it is enough for them and they are thankful, and go no further.

The same spirit, says Jukes, which makes the fool say, "There is no God," tempts even some Christians to say, "there is nought in much that Christ wrought for us."

4. The Burning

"And he shall take off from it all the fat of the bullock for the sin-offering; the fat that covereth the inwards, and all the fat that is upon the inwards,

"And the two kidneys, and the fat that is upon them, which is by the flanks, and the caul above the liver, with the kidneys, it shall he take away,

"As it was taken off from the bullock of the sacrifice of peace-offerings: and the priest shall burn them upon the altar of the burnt-offering.

"And the skin of the bullock, and all his flesh, with his head, and with his legs, and his inwards, and his dung,

"Even the whole bullock shall he carry forth without the camp unto a clean place, where the ashes are poured out, and burn him on the wood with fire: where the ashes are poured out shall he be burnt" (Lev. 4:8-12).

As in the peace-offering, so in this case all is not burnt upon the altar but only the choicest part, and for the same reason as in the other case. The peculiar variation in the offering of the two young pigeons (5:7-10) is explained in the nature of the victims. The fat of a dove would be so small in quantity and so difficult to separate with thoroughness that a second bird must be taken for

burning as a substitute for the fat of larger animals. What the burning of the fat meant in the other offerings, the burning of the second bird meant in this offering.

(1) Note that because of the solemn relation into which the expiatory victim had been brought to God, the offerer was not permitted to eat of its flesh for it was "most holy." The priest might eat a portion (6:26) as contributing to his own maintenance (1 Cor. 9:13), but even he was prohibited from doing so when he himself was the offerer, either as an individual or as included in the congregation.

(2) Note that the flesh must be burnt not upon the altar but "without the camp." Not only, as some think, to distinguish it from the burnt-offering whose symbolic meaning was so different, but because in one sense it was "unholy." That is to say, the offering was so identified with the sin for which it was offered, that it was looked upon *as* sin, and as such cast out into the wilderness. The "fat" was burned on the altar to show that the offering though made a sin-bearer, was itself perfect, but the body of the victim was cast forth. Compare here Hebrews 13:12, which shows Jesus, the only spotless offering this world ever witnessed, not only afflicted of man, but judged of God and smitten. And why? For the answer read Isaiah 53:10; 2 Corinthians 5:21, and 1 Peter 2:24.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews our attention is called to the fact that this part of the ritual prefigured Christ and the circumstances of His death very particularly (Heb. 13:10-12). As Dean Alford interprets this passage in Hebrews, it means that Jesus suffered outside the camp of legal Judaism and thus fulfilled the type of the sin-offering. In other words, His consecration of Himself to God found supreme expression in that He voluntarily submitted to be despised and rejected of men, even of the Israel of God. In the light of these marvelous correspondences between the type and the antitype, what a profound meaning more and more appears in those words of Christ concerning Moses, "He wrote of me" (Kellogg).

It remains to add that notwithstanding the inclusiveness of the cases for which the sin-offering was provided, there still remained some sins for which no offering was available. In other parts of the Pentateuch, the Israelites were taught that no satisfaction should be taken for the life of a murderer, or a blasphemer, or an adulterer. This was intended not only to emphasize the aggravated wickedness of such crimes, but also to develop in Israel the sense of need for a more adequate provision, a better sacrifice, as the Epistle to the Hebrews reveals (Heb. 8).

Review Questions

1. What difference do you observe in the introduction of the law of the sin-offering?

2. What is implied in this difference?

3. What is Jukes' explanation that this offering was unknown before?

4. Why was the law of Sinai given to men?

5. How is God's equity illustrated in the sin-offering?

6. Does ignorance cancel guilt?

7. What shows that guilt is proportioned to knowledge and responsibility?

8. What shows that God is no respecter of persons?

9. What deep significance attaches to the fact that the blood must be sprinkled before Jehovah?

10. Express Jukes' idea of the import of the varieties in the symbols.

11. Apply Jukes' idea of the varieties to the Christian's apprehension of Christ.

12. Why was the victim here burned "without the camp"?

13. Did the sin-offering avail for all acts of sin absolutely?

14. What was emphasized by its limitations?

15. More than twenty passages of Scripture are referred to in this lesson outside of the lesson text itself; how many of them have you examined?

LESSON VI

The Trespass-Offering
Leviticus 5:14-19; 6:1-7

IN ITS broad principle the trespass-offering is closely allied to the sin-offering and yet it differs from it in some particulars. The sin-offering represents *sin* in our nature, while the trespass-offering represents the *fruits of sin* in our nature. In the first *no particular act* of sin is named, but the person who has sinned is seen confessing himself as a sinner; while in the second the acts are enumerated and the person who committed them is rather in the background. The word "trespass" always has reference to an invasion of the rights of others in respect of property or service.

1. Compared with the Sin-Offering

Andrew Jukes who brings out the distinction between the sin and the trespass-offerings very clearly, expresses the conviction that many persons see the spiritual truth of the trespass-offering who have very imperfect ideas of Christ as the sin-offering. Nor is he thinking of unconverted people either when he says this, to whom, of course, acts of trespass are the only things discernible. But he is thinking of young Christians, who have much less perception of sin than of trespass. They speak of having done this evil or that, but seldom think of *themselves as being evil.* Not so the man who has grown in grace, who is sorry not so much for what he *does* as for what he *is* (Rom. 7:14-24). To such a man, what a joy to learn that Christ has died for what he is as well as for what he does!

2. No Variety or Gradation

"And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, If a soul commit a trespass, and sin through ignorance, in the holy things of the LORD; then he shall bring for his trespass unto the LORD a ram without blemish out of the flocks, with thy estimation by shekels of silver, after the shekel of the sanctuary, for a trespass-offering.

And he shall make amends for the harm that he hath done in the holy thing, and shall add the fifth part thereto, and give it unto the priest: and the priest shall make an atonement for him with the ram of the trespass-offering, and it shall be forgiven him" (Lev. 5:14-16).

The law of the trespass-offering really begins here, although the word "trespass" is found in the preceding part of the chapter (vv. 6, 7). The King James Version is in error there however, as the Revised Version points out. See also verse 12 where it is clear that the sin-offering is still in mind.

(1) Note that one may commit even a trespass through "ignorance," showing as Jukes says, how little man's judgment can be trusted respecting not only what he is but what he does (cf. Ps. 119:9, 11).

(2) Note that the trespass here spoken of is in "the holy things of the LORD." What things? Read Malachi 1:6-14 for an answer in part. (Also see Josh. 7:1; 2 Chron. 28:22-25). Those who live nearest to God will confess that which to others may seem incredible, that often there has been unwitting trespass in the holiest acts of work and worship. As Jukes says, there is no act of praise, or prayer, or any kind of ministry which may not, through Satan's cunning, prove an occasion to the flesh.

(3) Note that the trespasser must bring "a ram out of the flocks" as an offering in every case. Unlike the sin-offering for example, there is no variation either on account of the rank or the ability of the offender. The obligation of plenary satisfaction and reparation for the trespass committed could not be modified in any way. The man who has defrauded his neighbor, whether of a small or a large amount, abides as his debtor before God under all conditions until restitution is made.

The ram was a valuable offering as compared with a dove or pigeon or even a ewe or a lamb, but it was not a bullock, which might be quite out of the reach of many a poor man. The idea of value

must be represented, and yet not so represented as to exclude a large part of the people from the provisions of the trespass-offering.

Furthermore, the value must be according to God's standard, not man's. It must not fall below two shekels, and the shekel must be that of the sanctuary (Kellogg).

(4) Note that in the trespass-offering something additional is required to the sacrificial ram. The life must be laid down, but the value of the trespass must be paid to the injured party also. For the victim merely to die for trespass would leave the injured party still a loser, the death would not repair the trespass nor restore the rights of which another had been robbed. Yet till this was done perfect atonement or satisfaction could not be rendered.

"May one be pardon'd and retain the offense?
In the corrupted currents of this world
Offence's gilded hand may shove by justice,
And oft 'tis seen the wicked prize itself
Buys out the law; but 'tis not so above."
—The King of Denmark, in *Hamlet.*

3. Significance of the "Fifth Part"

Therefore, a "fifth part" more than the cost of trespass must be added in the indemnity. Jukes traces the idea associated with the "fifth part" back to the days of Joseph and the famine in Egypt (Gen. 47:13-26), where we cannot follow him just now. But we may say that the "fifth part" is a witness not only that the sum or the object yielded up has been so yielded up as a debt, and not as a free gift, but that the whole of that of which the fifth was paid, was the right and the property of the one to whom it was thus rendered. Moreover, the guilty person is not allowed to gain even a temporary advantage from the use of that which he has now restored. "The fifth part more" would quite over-balance it.

Wonderful, indeed, are the ways of God! How exact is His justice, and how perfectly adapted was the trespass-offering to educate the conscience of both the rich and poor!

"And if a soul sin, and commit any of these things which are forbidden to be done by the commandments of the LORD; though he wist it not, yet is he guilty, and shall bear his iniquity.

And he shall bring a ram without blemish out of the flock, with thy estimation, for a trespass-offering, unto the priest: and the priest shall make an atonement for him concerning his ignorance wherein he erred and wist it not, and it shall be forgiven him.

It is a trespass-offering: he hath certainly trespassed against the LORD" (Lev. 5:17-19).

In the former section the law provided for cases in which, though the trespass had been done unwittingly, yet the offender afterward came to know of it in its precise extent, so as to give exact basis for the restitution ordered in such cases.

But here he was in complete ignorance of it. He was aware of a trespass, in other words, but did not know just how much it was. A fifth part could not be applied in such a case, yet none the less he must bear his iniquity, the ram must be offered. The reference is still, doubtless, to a trespass "in the holy things of the LORD." If it had been a trespass against a neighbor, the exact cost might more readily have been ascertained.

4. What Constitutes Trespass

"And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, If a soul sin, and commit a trespass against the LORD, and lie unto his neighbor in that which was delivered him to keep, or in fellowship, or in a thing taken away by violence, or hath deceived his neighbor;

Or have found that which was lost, and lieth concerning it, and sweareth falsely; in any of all these that a man doeth, sinning therein;

Then it shall be, because he hath sinned, and is guilty, that he shall restore that which he took violently away, or the thing which he hath deceitfully gotten, or that which was delivered him to keep, or the lost thing which he found.

Or all that about which he hath sworn falsely: he shall even restore it in the principal, and shall add the fifth part more thereto, and give it unto him to whom it appertaineth, in the day of his trespass-offering.

And he shall bring his trespass-offering unto the LORD, a ram without blemish out of the flock, with thy estimation, for a trespass-offering unto the priest:

And the priest shall make an atonement for him before the LORD: and it shall be forgiven him for any thing of all that he hath done in trespassing therein" (Lev. 6:1-7).

These verses are quoted not because they present serious difficulties, but because they offer an opportunity for some very practical teaching in spiritual things. They recite some of the things which constitute trespass against one's neighbor, but for which the same offering must be presented and the same restitution made.

What are the things? (1) Dealing falsely with a neighbor in a matter of deposit (R. V.). Something was entrusted to a man and he sold it or used it unlawfully as if it were his own. (2) Dealing falsely in a bargain (R. V.). A man sold some goods or a piece of land and represented them to be better than they were, or asked a larger price than they were worth. (3) Robbery, "a thing taken away by violence," even perhaps under color of legal forms as we might now say. (4) Oppression, taking advantage of a neighbor's circumstances to extort from him to his disadvantage. (5) Finding and keeping a lost article belonging to some one else.

In all these cases the prescription is the same as in analogous offenses in the holy things of Jehovah. First, the guilty man must confess the wrong which he has done (Num. 5:5-7), then restitution must be made of that of which he has defrauded his neighbor, and then one-fifth additional. But while this may set him right with man, it does not yet set him right with God; hence the trespass-offering completes the law.

Of course, like all the others, the trespass-offering pointed to Christ who is "the end of the law unto righteousness" (Rom. 10:4). As our

5. Pointing to Christ

burnt-offering He became our righteousness in full self-surrender; as our peace-offering He became our life in fellowship with God; as our sin-offering He became the expiation for our sins, and as our trespass-offering He made satisfaction and full reparation on our behalf to the God on whose rights in us we had trespassed by our sins without measure. See Isaiah 53:10 where the Hebrew word for "an offering for sin", is the same which through all this Levitical law is rendered trespass, or "guilt" offering. In the New Testament also, as the correlate of the trespass-offering we find sin frequently set forth as a debt owed from man to God (Matt. 6: 12; 18:23-35; Luke 7:41, 42).

Kellogg reminds us that this representation of Christ's work has in all ages been "the offense of the Cross," for which reason there is all the more need for us to insist that Christ is our trespass-offering, whose death affects our salvation not merely through its moral influence but by its expiation and reparation. This truth is ever to be set forth against all Modernism, Liberalism or Unitarian theology in any other name.

Review Questions

1. In what fundamental way does the trespass-offering differ from the sin-offering?
2. What is involved in the meaning of the word "trespass"?
3. In which of the two offerings is the spiritual truth more easily discerned?
4. What are meant by the holy things of the Lord?
5. Why was something additional required to the sacrificial ram?
6. Name some of the things constituting trespass against one's neighbor.
7. To whom does the trespass-offering point?
8. State the different ways in which Christ is our substitute, as represented by the different offerings.
9. Is sin ever spoken of in the Bible as a debt to God? If so, where?

LESSON VII

The Offerings as a Whole*

THE essential thing which constitutes a Christian is union with Christ. Not a visionary or a changeful thing is this union, but a reality wrought in and for the true believer by the Holy Spirit. Every reader of the New Testament is familiar with the phrase so frequently employed by the apostle Paul, "in Christ Jesus," (2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 1:22, Eph. 1:3; 1 Thess. 4:16). This phrase expresses the union, and it is illustrated for us by such figures as the vine and the branches (John 15:1-8), the bridegroom and the bride (John 3:29; Rev. 9:1; Eph. 5:30-32), and especially the human body (Rom. 12:4, 5; 1 Cor. 12:12-14; Eph. 1:22, 23).

These figures we ourselves could never have conceived of or have dared to appropriate, but they have been given to us by God's grace in His holy Word, and they are sealed in our hearts as true by the Holy Spirit. Indeed, so entirely one is the believer with Christ, that in God's mind and purpose he died when Christ died and rose again when He arose (Rom. 6:3-11; Col. 2:12; 3:1-4; 1 John 4:17).

II

Now this fact establishes what it has become accustomed to call our *standing* or *position* before God in Christ. That is to say, Christ as our substitute has met all the claims of God upon us as sinners in His sight and violators of His law. He has reconciled us to God. In Him we are now presented "holy and unblameable and unreproveable in His sight" (Col. 1:22). The Head of the body being holy, all the members are holy, the Head being without blame and without rebuke, all the members of the body are, in the Head, without blame and without rebuke. The recognition of this judicial fact, or rather the faith of it, gives peace (Rom. 5:1, 2).

But the believer's union with Christ not only affects his standing or position before God, but also what the apostle Paul calls our *walk;* i. e., our character and conduct (Eph. 4:1, 17; 5:2, 8, 15).

Of course, our walk, or conduct, is constantly very far short of that which it ought to be. It was so with Paul himself, who wrote to the Philippians that he had not "already attained," but that he followed after, if that he might apprehend that for which also he was apprehended of Christ Jesus (3:12).

Our walk is a matter of experience, the measure of our spiritual life or power, and that depends upon the measure in which we truly apprehend our standing or position in Christ, and endeavor to live up to the standard which it implies. That standard is the walk of Christ Himself. "He that saith he abideth in Him, ought himself also to walk even as He walked" (1 John 2:6), and it is the work of the Holy Spirit to verify in the members of Christ's body that which is already true *for* them as well as *of* them in their Head. It all depends on how far their own will would have it so by yielding themselves to the operation of the Holy Spirit.

This shows us, therefore, that what is true of Christ as our Head cannot be looked at alone in its connection with our standing. If we are Christ's, then what is true of Him as our Head must necessarily take us further. It must lead us to know what should be the measure of our walk, it must teach us what is unbecoming to our calling, what is contrary to our life in Him, and it must urge us on to be conformed to Him in all things.

Here is where Christians seem very seriously to differ, some seeing one part of the truth but incapable apparently of seeing both parts. Some press that which bears upon our standing and some that which bears upon our walk, whereas both are to be pressed as it were, alike. And where they are not pressed alike, there is always some kind of spiritual

*Abridged with a few changes from *The Law of the Offerings*. by Andrew Jukes, First American Edition.

deformity and weakness. Those who see the standard for our walk in Christ, but do not see our place, our position before God in Him, may try to apprehend, they may try to attain unto the walk, but there will be an awful absence of that joy and strength which come only from the knowledge of our position. And because of the absence of that joy and strength, there will be on their part an ever lowering of the standard of their walk, and a seeking only of so much of the fruit of the Spirit as will prove them to be Christians and no more.

On the other hand, they who see their standing or position in Christ, but who do not see that this implies a daily dying with Him, and a daily rising again, are susceptible, alas! to very serious temptation on the other side, to continue in sin, as it were, that grace may abound (Rom. 6:1). This is to speak of union with Christ in name, but to deny it in fact.

III

Now to connect this with the offerings. These set forth Christ. We see in them how man in Christ has made atonement. In the sin and trespass-offerings the sin of man has been fully borne, and in the burnt and meal-offerings all God's requirements are satisfied. Christ has been "without the camp" for us and has been laid upon the altar for us. "By one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified" (Heb. 10:14). This is our standing, or position, as believers in Him.

But now comes the other aspect of the truth. His offering, as our example, sets before us the model and the standard for our self-sacrifice. His sacrifice, as we saw in our previous lessons, had varied aspects, as satisfying God, as satisfying man, and as bearing sin, and so must our self-sacrifice, though in a lower sense, so far as it is conformed to His, have the same aspects. Not as though, by our self-sacrifice we could make Christ's offering for us more acceptable, certainly not, but as the consequence of our acceptance in Him and as the fruit of our union with Him through the Holy Spirit (Phil. 3:10).

1. Take the Burnt-Offering

It was *wholly* burnt, teaching us the obligation of entire self-surrender. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart." We cannot do this without its costing us something.

But not only was the burnt-offering wholly burnt, but consider *the nature of the offering itself.* The bullock, the lamb, the turtle-dove, each brought out typically some distinct particular in the character of our blessed Lord, setting us a particular example, however far we may be from attaining it. In them we see patient service, unmurmuring submission, gentleness and innocency of life. In other words, self-sacrifice in Christ, and for Christ, will not make us heroes in the world. Service, submission, meekness gain no earthly crowns.

2. Take the Meal Offering

Here, as man for men, Christ offered Himself as man's meat. He gave Himself to God with special reference to man and as meeting man's claim on Him. That is to say, man has a claim upon his fellow-man, one which God ratified in the second table of the law, saying: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

It was in the meal-offering that Christ met and satisfied this claim, by giving Himself to God as man's portion. How far therefore, in the light of His sacrifice, may we do the same, i. e., yield ourselves to God as man's meat?

In reply, consider the nature or character of the meal-offering, the bruised corn, the oil, the salt, the frankincense. Consider also that as in the case of the burnt-offering, the whole of it was consumed. Then let us ask, has man ever complied with this, or has he ever been conformed to this pattern?

In Acts 4:32-35, we find something approaching it in the history of the apostolic church. As Jukes says, in that day men were living who for the gospel's sake had "lost all things," and yet were willing to suffer more, even to give their own lives to God for others. Compare also Paul in Philippians 2:17 and Phoebe,

Romans 16:1, 2. The opportunity and the need for this self-sacrifice on behalf of our fellow-man still continue, and just in the measure that the disciple is like his Master, will he "do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith" (Gal. 6:10). "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because He laid down His life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren" (1 John 3:16).

In this we saw that God was fed, the priest was fed and the offerer also. They all were represented as seated at one table in God's house.

3. Take the Peace-Offering

In what sense is God fed by our offerings, it may be asked? In what sense is He satisfied by them? Romans 12:1; 2 Corinthians 9:7; Philippians 4:18 and Hebrews 13:16 answer that question. The works of the flesh are indeed dead works, useless, and worse than useless. They cannot be acceptable to God. But in our zeal against salvation by works, let us be careful to discriminate. There is such a thing as "the fruit of the spirit" to be produced in us, and this witnesses of His grace and is an offering to His praise.

The priest who was fed by the peace-offering represented Christ Himself, and poor as our offerings are, Christ finds joy in them. "I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat, I was thirsty and ye gave me drink" (Matt. 25:35). As Jukes says, if we only realized His gladness in some work or labor of love, forgotten it may be by the feeble doer, but treasured in the book of life, we could not have the narrow, selfish, grudging hearts that many of us have.

And the peace-offering fed the offerer himself. Strangers to self-sacrifice have we been, if we need to be told the joy it imparts to him who sacrifices. "Yea, and if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy, and rejoice with you all" (Phil. 2:17). See also Col. 1:24. "It is more blessed to give than to receive" (Acts 20:35).

IV

Thus far only the sweet-savour offerings have been considered in their application to the Christian's walk, but what about the sin-offering? If it applies, of course it can be only in a secondary way, for a saint cannot atone for himself. But may it apply in a secondary way? Jukes thinks that it may, using 1 Peter 3:18 and 4:1 in illustrating the point.

The first of the above passages shows us Christ as once suffering for sin, "the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God," while the second says: "Forasmuch then, as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind; for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin."

In other words, the saint, knowing that for him Christ has borne the Cross, follows on by that Cross to judge and put to death all that he finds in himself still contrary to his Lord. That is to say, instead of making Christ's Cross the reprieve for that which is still in him of the old nature, he will use that Cross to slay it, he will not plead it as an excuse for carnal and careless walking. See Romans 6:6; 1 Corinthians 11:31; Galatians 6:14; Philippians 3:19.

How full of teaching is the sin-offering, viewed even in this lower light, merely as an example to us!

But the trespass-offering, what of that? In this, restitution was made for the wrong; the original claim with an added "fifth" was paid by the trespasser. This was fulfilled for us in Christ, at whose hands God received all of that of which man had robbed Him. He made a full atonement for us.

But now how should this offering affect our walk, our character, and conduct?

Of course, we can make no restitution to God in the sense in which Christ made it. If all the rest of our lives were wholly spent for God, it were only our duty in the premises, and could not atone for the omissions and transgressions of the past. Each day would bring its own proper claim.

And yet, there is a sense, as Jukes points out, in which the saint in fellowship with Christ will make restitution, a sense in which as a Christian he will act in grace toward others, a sense in which he will add the "fifth." He will fulfill Christ's command, "Do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you" (Matt. 5:38, 44). Cf. also Mark 11:25, 26 and Luke 6:32-35.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What is the essential thing constituting a Christian?
2. How is it illustrated in Scripture?
3. What does it establish in the Christian's relationship to God?
4. What else does it affect?
5. What is the Christian's standard of character?
6. How or by whom is this effected in the Christian?
7. How do Christians seem to differ on this point?
8. What does the burnt-offering teach us as to our "walk" in Christ?
9. The meal-offering?
10. The peace-offering?
11. The sin-offering?
12. The trespass-offering?
13. How many New Testament scriptures are quoted or referred to in this lesson?
14. How many have you personally examined?

INDEX

Page

Burnt-Offerings - - - - - - - 6, 28

Continual Burnt-Offering - - - 10
Continual Meal-Offering - - - - 15

First-Fruits - - - - - - - - - 14

Honey - - - - - - - - - - - 14

Leaven - - - - - - - - - - 14
Leviticus, Book of - - - - - - - 3

Meal-Offering - - - - - - - 11, 28

Offerings as a Whole - - - - - 27
Origin and Authority - - - - - 3

Peace-Offering - - - - - - - 15, 29

Salt - - - - - - - - - - - - 14
Sin-Offering - - - - - - - - - 19

Trespass-Offering - - - - - 24, 29

By Dr. JAMES M. GRAY

THE CHRISTIAN WORKERS COMMENTARY on the Old and New Testaments. A better single-volume commentary on the whole Bible, by chapters, for the every-day needs of inquiring Christians, cannot be had. 8vo, cloth, net $3.00.

SYNTHETIC BIBLE STUDIES (Enlarged, revised, completed). Affords a mastery of Bible by books. Most excellent as a Whole Bible Course lesson help. 8vo, cloth, net $2.25.

PRIMERS OF THE FAITH. How we know that the Bible is Genuine, Credible, and Divine. 16mo, cloth, net $1.25.

A TEXT BOOK ON PROPHECY. Written that every Christian may know and understand "what shall be hereafter." 12mo, cloth, net $1.25.

PROPHECY AND THE LORD'S RETURN. The What, When, Why, and How of Christ's second coming. 12mo, cloth, net 75c.

HOW TO MASTER THE ENGLISH BIBLE. An inspiration to adopt the only method that leads to power. 18mo, cloth, net 50c.

THE ANTIDOTE TO CHRISTIAN SCIENCE. Rom. VI, Gal. V, Eph. I, Col. III, 2 Thess. II, Heb. VI and 1 John IV are the basis of this most effective treatise. 12mo, cloth, net 75c.

SPIRITISM AND THE FALLEN ANGELS. Man's experience with the powers of darkness in all ages and God's Word dealing with it comprehensively set forth. 12mo, cloth, $1.25 net.

PROGRESS IN THE LIFE TO COME. What God has revealed respecting the righteous dead from Abel to the millennium and after. 12mo, boards, net 50c.

A PICTURE OF THE RESURRECTION. Gives full value to the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians. 12mo, boards, net 50c.

BIBLE PROBLEMS EXPLAINED. Important questions of wide range scripturally clarified. 16mo, paper, 30c; cloth, net 75c.

SATAN AND THE SAINT. Satan's systematic efforts to deceive exposed, and what will happen before and when Christ comes again. 16mo, paper, 30c; cloth, net 75c.

GREAT EPOCHS OF SACRED HISTORY. The first twelve chapters of Genesis expounded, with present-day relationships. 16mo, paper, 30c; cloth, net 75c.

SALVATION FROM START TO FINISH. How lost sinners become glorified saints set forth in eight evangelistic Bible expositions. 16mo, paper, 30c; cloth, net 75c.

ONENESS WITH CHRIST. An exposition of Colossians, by W. R. Nicholson, edited by Dr. Gray. 12mo, cloth, net $1.25.

CHRIST IN THE SACRIFICIAL OFFERINGS. Bible Studies in Leviticus. 8vo, art stock covers, net 35c.

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE BELIEVER. A help to the right understanding of the relation of the Holy Spirit to the believer, and a call to receive the deeper work of the Spirit in the heart. 16 pp., 4c; doz., 40c; 100, $2.00.

THE ERRORS OF "MILLENNIAL DAWNISM". A valuable booklet with which to meet the fallacies of the pernicious teaching of "Russellism." 24 pp., each 5c; doz., 50c; 100, $3.00.

THE FUTURE RETRIBUTION OF THE WICKED. As shown in the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus. 16 pp., each, 3c; doz., 30c; 100, $2.00.

HOW THE BIBLE ANSWERS CONAN DOYLE. 8 pp., each, 5c; doz., 50c; 100, $3.75.

WHY WE BELIEVE IN THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST. 14 pp., 7c each; doz., 75c; 100, $5.50.

THE OUTPOSTS OF THE CITADEL OR WHY I BELIEVE THE BIBLE WILL STAND. 14 pp., 7c each; doz., 75c; 100, $5.50.

THE BIBLE INSTITUTE COLPORTAGE ASS'N
826 North La Salle Street Chicago, Illinois

Date Due

My 5 41			
My 30 46			
SEP 30 1988			

Gaylord
PAMPHLET BINDER
Syracuse, N. Y.
Stockton, Calif.

BS1255 .8 .G77
Christ in the sacrificial offerings
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00035 2544